arXiv:1410.7354v1 [math.PR] 27 Oct 2014

THE MITTAG–LEFFLER PROCESS AND A SCALING LIMIT FOR THE BLOCK COUNTING PROCESS OF THE BOLTHAUSEN–SZNITMAN COALESCENT

M. Möhle[1]

October 23, 2014

Abstract

The Mittag–Leffler process $X = (X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is introduced. This Markov process has the property that its marginal random variables X_t are Mittag–Leffler distributed with parameter e^{-t}, $t \in [0,\infty)$, and the semigroup $(T_t)_{t\geq 0}$ of X satisfies $T_t f(x) = \mathbb{E}(f(x^{e^{-t}} X_t))$ for all $x \geq 0$ and all bounded measurable functions $f : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$. Further characteristics of the process X are derived, for example an explicit formula for the joint moments of its finite dimensional distributions. The main result states that the block counting process of the Bolthausen–Sznitman n-coalescent, properly scaled, converges in the Skorohod topology to the Mittag–Leffler process X as the sample size n tends to infinity.

Keywords: block counting process; Bolthausen–Sznitman coalescent; marginal distributions; Mittag–Leffler process; weak convergence

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 60F05; 60J27 Secondary 92D15; 97K60

1 Introduction and main results

Exchangeable coalescent processes with multiple collisions are Markov processes with state space $\mathcal{P}$, the set of partitions of $\mathbb{N} := \{1, 2, \ldots\}$. During each transition blocks merge together to form a single block. These processes are characterized by a measure Λ on the unit interval $[0, 1]$. For more information on these processes we refer the reader to [14] and [15]. The Bolthausen–Sznitman coalescent [2] is the particular Λ-coalescent $\Pi = (\Pi_t)_{t\geq 0}$ with Λ being the uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$. In this article we focus on the process $\Pi^{(n)} = (\Pi_t^{(n)})_{t\geq 0}$ of the Bolthausen–Sznitman coalescent Π restricted to a sample of size $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We are in particular interested in the process $N^{(n)} := (N_t^{(n)})_{t\geq 0}$, where $N_t^{(n)}$ denotes the number of blocks of $\Pi_t^{(n)}$. The process $N^{(n)}$ is called the block counting process of the Bolthausen–Sznitman n-coalescent. It is well known that $N^{(n)}$ is a time-homogeneous Markov chain with generator $Q = (q_{ij})_{1\leq i,j\leq n}$ having entries $q_{ij} := i/((i-j)(i-j+1))$ if $i > j$, $q_{ij} := 1 - i$ if $i = j$ and $q_{ij} = 0$ if $i < j$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in [0,\infty)$ define

$$X_t^{(n)} := \frac{N_t^{(n)}}{n^{e^{-t}}}. \tag{1}$$

We call $X^{(n)} := (X_t^{(n)})_{t\geq 0}$ the scaled block counting process of the Bolthausen–Sznitman n-coalescent. The scaling $n^{e^{-t}}$ in (1) is somewhat unusual since it involves not only the parameter n but also the time parameter t. Clearly, $X^{(n)}$ is a Markov process with state space $E := [0,\infty)$, however, since the scaling depends on t, $X^{(n)}$ is time-inhomogeneous. Our main result (Theorem 1.1 below) provides a distributional limiting result for $X^{(n)}$ as the sample size n

[1]Mathematisches Institut, Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, Auf der Morgenstelle 10, 72076 Tübingen, Germany, E-mail address: martin.moehle@uni-tuebingen.de

tends to infinity. The arising limiting Markov process $X = (X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ we call the Mittag–Leffler process, since the marginal random variable X_t turns out to be Mittag–Leffler distributed with parameter e^{-t}. Note that the distribution of X_t is uniquely determined by its entire moments $\mathbb{E}(X_t^m) = m!/\Gamma(1 + me^{-t})$, $m \in \mathbb{N}_0 := \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$. For detailed information on the Mittag–Leffler distribution and on the process X we refer the reader to Section 2, where the existence of X is established and fundamental properties of this process are derived. In order to wipe out possible confusion with processes in the literature having similar names we mention that the process X has nothing in common with the autoregressive Mittag–Leffler process studied for example by Jayakumar [7] and Jayakumar and Pillai [8]. These processes are based on the (heavy-tailed) Mittag–Leffler distribution of the first type (see, for example, [11] and [13] for some related works), whereas the Mittag–Leffler distributed random variable X_t is of the second type and has finite moments of all orders. Let us now present our main convergence result.

Theorem 1.1 *For the Bolthausen–Sznitman coalescent the scaled block counting process $X^{(n)} = (X_t^{(n)})_{t\geq 0}$ defined via (1) converges in $D_E[0,\infty)$ as $n \to \infty$ to the Mittag–Leffler process $X = (X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ introduced in Section 2.*

Remarks. 1. Theorem 1.1 can be also stated logarithmically as follows. The process $(\log N_t^{(n)} - e^{-t}\log n)_{t\geq 0}$ converges in $D_{\mathbb{R}}[0,\infty)$ to the process $(\log X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ as $n \to \infty$. Neither X nor $(\log X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is a Lévy process. Note that the logarithmic block counting process $(\log N_t^{(n)})_{t\geq 0}$ plays an important role in the problem of whether a coalescent process comes down from infinity, see, for example, Section 4 of [9].
2. Note that $X^{(n)}$ is time-inhomogeneous whereas the limiting process X is time-homogeneous. Thus, Theorem 1.1 in particular states that $X^{(n)}$ is asymptotically time-homogeneous.

The article is organized as follows. Section 2 is devoted to the Mittag–Leffler process X. We prove the existence of this process and derive fundamental properties of X, among them representations for the semigroup of X (see (8)) and an explicit formula for the joint moments (see Lemma 2.1) of the finite-dimensional distributions of X. In Section 3 we provide some fundamental formulas (see Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 3.2) for certain moments of the block counting process $N^{(n)}$ of the Bolthausen–Sznitman n-coalescent. These results rely on the spectral decomposition [12] of the generator of the block counting process. Lemma 3.1 in particular shows that $N_t^{(n)}$ has mean

$$\mathbb{E}(N_t^{(n)}) \;=\; \frac{\Gamma(n + e^{-t})}{\Gamma(n)\Gamma(1 + e^{-t})} \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}, t \in [0,\infty). \tag{2}$$

For large n the mean (2) is asymptotically equal to $n^{e^{-t}}(\Gamma(1 + e^{-t}))^{-1} = n^{e^{-t}}\mathbb{E}(X_t)$, which indicates that $n^{e^{-t}}$ is the appropriate scaling in order to obtain a non-degenerate limiting process for the scaled block counting process as n tends to infinity. In the final Section 4 this argument is made rigorous leading to a proof of Theorem 1.1. First the convergence of the finite-dimensional distributions is verified and afterwards the convergence in $D_E[0,\infty)$ is established.
We leave it open for future work to establish convergence results in analogy to Theorem 1.1 for the block counting process $N^{(n)}$ of more general coalescent processes (that do not come down from infinity), for example for the $\beta(a,b)$-coalescent with $a \geq 1$ (and $b > 0$).

2 The Mittag–Leffler process

Before we come to the Mittag–Leffler process let us briefly mention some well known results on the Mittag–Leffler distribution. Let $\eta = \eta(\alpha)$ be a random variable being Mittag–Leffler distributed with parameter $\alpha \in [0,1]$. Note that η has moments

$$\mathbb{E}(\eta^m) \;=\; \frac{\Gamma(1+m)}{\Gamma(1+m\alpha)}, \qquad m \in [0,\infty),$$

and that the entire moments $\mathbb{E}(\eta^m)$, $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, uniquely determine the distribution of η. Clearly, η is standard exponentially distributed for $\alpha = 0$ and $\mathbb{P}(\eta = 1) = 1$ for $\alpha = 1$.
If $\alpha_n \to \alpha$, then the moments of $\eta(\alpha_n)$ converge to those of $\eta(\alpha)$, which implies the convergence $\eta(\alpha_n) \to \eta(\alpha)$ in distribution as $n \to \infty$. Thus, the map $\alpha \mapsto \mathbb{P}_{\eta(\alpha)}$ is a continuous function from $[0,1]$ to the space $\mathcal{P}(E)$ of probability measures on $E := [0,\infty)$ equipped with the topology of convergence in distribution.
For $\alpha \in (0,1)$ the Mittag–Leffler distribution can be characterized in terms of an exponential integral of a particular subordinator as follows. Let $S = (S_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be a drift-free subordinator with killing rate $k := 1/\Gamma(1-\alpha)$ and Lévy measure ϱ having density

$$u \;\mapsto\; \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \frac{e^{-u/\alpha}}{(1-e^{-u/\alpha})^{\alpha+1}}, \qquad u \in (0,\infty), \tag{3}$$

with respect to Lebesgue measure on $(0,\infty)$. It is readily checked (see Lemma 5.1 in the appendix) that S has Laplace exponent

$$\Phi(x) \;=\; \frac{\Gamma(1+\alpha x)}{\Gamma(1-\alpha+\alpha x)}, \qquad x \in [0,\infty). \tag{4}$$

The distribution of the exponential integral $I := \int_0^\infty e^{-S_t}\mathrm{d}t$ is uniquely determined (see [3]) via its entire moments

$$\mathbb{E}(I^m) \;=\; \frac{m!}{\Phi(1)\cdots\Phi(m)} \;=\; m! \prod_{j=1}^{m} \frac{\Gamma(1+(j-1)\alpha)}{\Gamma(1+j\alpha)} \;=\; \frac{\Gamma(1+m)}{\Gamma(1+m\alpha)}, \qquad m \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Thus, I is Mittag–Leffler distributed with parameter α.

2.1 Existence of the Mittag–Leffler process

In this subsection we prove the existence of a particular Markov process $X = (X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ having sample paths in $D_E[0,\infty)$ such that every X_t is Mittag–Leffler distributed with parameter e^{-t}. Constructing Markov processes with given marginal distributions has attained some interest in the literature, mainly in the context of (semi)martingales. We exemplary refer the reader to [10] and the references therein. Note however, that the process X we are going to construct will be neither a supermartingale nor a submartingale.
For $t \in [0,\infty)$ let η_t be a random variable being Mittag–Leffler distributed with parameter e^{-t}. Define $p : [0,\infty) \times E \times \mathcal{B}(E)$ via

$$p(t,x,B) \;:=\; \mathbb{E}(1_B(x^{e^{-t}}\eta_t)) \;=\; \mathbb{P}(x^{e^{-t}}\eta_t \in B). \tag{5}$$

The definition of p is such that for all $(t,x) \in [0,\infty) \times E$ the random variable $x^{e^{-t}}\eta_t$ has distribution $p(t,x,.)$. In particular, $p(t,x,.)$ has moments

$$\int_E y^m p(t,x,\mathrm{d}y) \;=\; \mathbb{E}((x^{e^{-t}}\eta_t)^m) \;=\; x^{me^{-t}} \frac{\Gamma(1+m)}{\Gamma(1+me^{-t})}, \qquad m \in [0,\infty), \tag{6}$$

and the entire moments $\int_E y^m p(t,x,\mathrm{d}y)$, $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, uniquely determine the distribution $p(t,x,.)$. In order to verify the Chapman–Kolmogorov property

$$p(s+t,x,B) \;=\; \int_E p(s,y,B)\, p(t,x,\mathrm{d}y), \qquad s,t \in [0,\infty), x \in E, B \in \mathcal{B}(E), \tag{7}$$

fix $s,t \in [0,\infty)$ and $x \in E$. Define $\mu_1(B) := p(s+t,x,B)$ and $\mu_2(B) := \int_E p(s,y,B)\, p(t,x,\mathrm{d}y)$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}(E)$. Clearly, μ_1 and μ_2 are probability measures on E. By (6), μ_1 has moments

$$\int_E z^m\, \mu_1(\mathrm{d}z) \;=\; \int_E z^m p(s+t,x,\mathrm{d}z) \;=\; x^{me^{-(s+t)}} \frac{\Gamma(1+m)}{\Gamma(1+me^{-(s+t)})}, \qquad m \in \mathbb{N}_0,$$

and these moments uniquely determine μ_1. By Fubini's theorem and (6), μ_2 has moments

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_E z^m\, \mu_2(\mathrm{d}z) \;&=\; \int_E z^m \int_E p(s,y,\mathrm{d}z)\, p(t,x,\mathrm{d}y) \;=\; \int_E \left(\int_E z^m p(s,y,\mathrm{d}z) \right) p(t,x,\mathrm{d}y) \\
&=\; \int_E y^{me^{-s}} \frac{\Gamma(1+m)}{\Gamma(1+me^{-s})}\, p(t,x,\mathrm{d}y) \;=\; \frac{\Gamma(1+m)}{\Gamma(1+me^{-s})} \int_E y^{me^{-s}} p(t,x,\mathrm{d}y) \\
&=\; \frac{\Gamma(1+m)}{\Gamma(1+me^{-s})} x^{me^{-s}e^{-t}} \frac{\Gamma(1+me^{-s})}{\Gamma(1+me^{-s}e^{-t})} \;=\; x^{me^{-(s+t)}} \frac{\Gamma(1+m)}{\Gamma(1+me^{-(s+t)})},
\end{aligned}$$

and these moments uniquely determine μ_2. Since the moments of μ_1 and μ_2 coincide, it follows that $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ and the Chapman–Kolmogorov property (7) is established. Thus, the family $(T_t)_{t\geq 0}$ of linear operators T_t, defined via

$$T_t f(x) \;:=\; \int_E f(y)\, p(t,x,\mathrm{d}y) \;=\; \mathbb{E}(f(x^{e^{-t}}\eta_t)), \qquad t \in [0,\infty), f \in B(E), x \in E, \tag{8}$$

defines a semigroup on $B(E)$, the set of bounded measurable functions $f : E \to \mathbb{R}$ equipped with the supremum norm $\|f\| := \sup_{x\in E} |f(x)|$. Note that (8) is also well defined for some unbounded functions, for example for all polynomials $f : E \to \mathbb{R}$. The semigroup $(T_t)_{t\geq 0}$ on $B(E)$ is clearly conservative, since $T_t 1 = 1$ for all $t \in [0,\infty)$. We have $\|T_t f\| = \sup_{x\in E} |\mathbb{E}(f(x^{e^{-t}}\eta_t))| \leq \sup_{x\in E} \mathbb{E}(|f(x^{e^{-t}}\eta_t)|) \leq \|f\|$ for all $t \in [0,\infty)$ and all $f \in B(E)$. Thus, $\|T_t\| \leq 1$ for all $t \in [0,\infty)$, so the semigroup $(T_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is contracting. Moreover, $(T_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is obviously positive meaning that each operator T_t maps nonnegative functions (in $B(E)$) to nonnegative functions.

Let $\widehat{C}(E) \subseteq B(E)$ denote the Banach space of continuous functions $f : E \to \mathbb{R}$ vanishing at infinity. Using the dominated convergence theorem it is easily seen (see Lemma 5.3 in the appendix) that $T_t\widehat{C}(E) \subseteq \widehat{C}(E)$ for all $t \in [0,\infty)$. With some more effort (see again Lemma 5.3) it can be shown by exploiting the theorem of Heine that, for all $f \in \widehat{C}(E)$, $T_t f(x) \to f(x)$ as $t \to 0$ uniformly for all $x \in E$. Therefore, $(T_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is strongly continuous on $\widehat{C}(E)$, thus a Feller semigroup on $\widehat{C}(E)$. Hence (see, for example, [4, p. 169, Theorem 2.7]) there exists a

Markov process $X = (X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ corresponding to $(T_t)_{t\geq 0}$ with initial distribution $\mathbb{P}(X_0 = 1) = 1$ and sample paths in the space $D_E[0,\infty)$ of right continuous functions $x : [0,\infty) \to E$ with left limits equipped with the Skorohod topology. Note that $\mathbb{E}(f(X_{s+t}) \,|\, X_u, u \leq s) = T_t f(X_s)$ for all $f \in B(E)$ and all $s, t \in [0,\infty)$ and that

$$\mathbb{P}(X_{s+t} \in B \,|\, X_u, u \leq s) \;=\; p(t, X_s, B), \qquad s, t \in [0,\infty), B \in \mathcal{B}(E).$$

From $\mathbb{E}(f(X_t)) = \mathbb{E}(f(X_t) \,|\, X_0) = T_t f(1) = \mathbb{E}(f(\eta_t))$, $f \in B(E)$, $t \in [0,\infty)$, we conclude that X_t has the same distribution as η_t, so X_t is Mittag–Leffler distributed with parameter e^{-t}. We therefore call X the *Mittag–Leffler process*.
Clearly, $X_t \to X_\infty$ in distribution as $t \to \infty$, where X_∞ is standard exponentially distributed. Thus, the stationary distribution of X is the standard exponential distribution.

Remark. The Chapman–Kolmogoroff property holds whenever the random variable η_t introduced at the beginning of the construction in this subsection has moments of the form $\mathbb{E}(\eta_t^m) = h(m)/h(me^{-t})$ for some given function $h : [0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$. We have carried out the construction for $h(x) := \Gamma(1+x)$ leading to the Mittag–Leffler process. More generally, one may use other functions h, for example $h(x) := \Gamma(\beta + x)$ for some constant β, leading to a construction of a wider class of Markov processes $X = (X_t)_{t\geq 0}$.

2.2 Further properties of the Mittag–Leffler process

In this subsection we derive some further properties of the Mittag–Leffler process X. The following lemma provides a formula for the moments of the finite-dimensional distributions of X.

Lemma 2.1 (Moments of the finite-dimensional distributions of X) *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 = t_0 \leq t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_k$ and $m_1, \ldots, m_k \in [0,\infty)$. For $j \in \{0,\ldots,k\}$ define $x_j := x_j(k) := \sum_{i=j+1}^k m_i e^{-(t_i - t_j)}$. Note that $x_k = 0$ and $x_0 = \sum_{i=1}^k m_i e^{-t_i}$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{t_1}^{m_1} \cdots X_{t_k}^{m_k}) \;=\; \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{\Gamma(1 + x_j + m_j)}{\Gamma(1 + x_{j-1})} \tag{9}$$

and the entire moments $\mathbb{E}(X_{t_1}^{m_1} \cdots X_{t_k}^{m_k})$, $m_1, \ldots, m_k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, uniquely determine the distribution of $(X_{t_1}, \ldots, X_{t_k})$. In particular, $\mathbb{E}(X_t^m) = \Gamma(1+m)/\Gamma(1+me^{-t})$, $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $t \in [0,\infty)$, and, hence, $\mathbb{E}(X_t) = 1/\Gamma(1+e^{-t})$ and $\mathrm{Var}(X_t) = \mathbb{E}(X_t^2) - (\mathbb{E}(X_t))^2 = 2/\Gamma(1+2e^{-t}) - 1/(\Gamma(1+e^{-t}))^2$, $t \in [0,\infty)$.

Proof. Induction on k. Clearly, (9) holds for $k = 1$, since X_{t_1} is Mittag–Leffler distributed with parameter e^{-t_1}. The induction step from $k-1$ to k works as follows. We have

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{t_1}^{m_1} \cdots X_{t_k}^{m_k}) \;=\; \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}(X_{t_1}^{m_1} \cdots X_{t_k}^{m_k} \,|\, X_{t_1}, \ldots, X_{t_{k-1}})) \;=\; \mathbb{E}(X_{t_1}^{m_1} \cdots X_{t_{k-1}}^{m_{k-1}} \mathbb{E}(X_{t_k}^{m_k} \,|\, X_{t_{k-1}})).$$

Define $f_m(x) := x^m$ for convenience. Using the formula (8) for the semigroup operator T_t, the last conditional expectation is given by

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{t_k}^{m_k} \,|\, X_{t_{k-1}}) \;=\; (T_{t_k - t_{k-1}} f_{m_k})(X_{t_{k-1}}) \;=\; \frac{\Gamma(1+m_k)}{\Gamma(1 + m_k e^{-(t_k - t_{k-1})})} X_{t_{k-1}}^{m_k e^{-(t_k - t_{k-1})}}.$$

We therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(X_{t_1}^{m_1}\cdots X_{t_k}^{m_k}) &= \frac{\Gamma(1+m_k)}{\Gamma(1+m_k e^{-(t_k-t_{k-1})})}\mathbb{E}(X_{t_1}^{m_1}\cdots X_{t_{k-2}}^{m_{k-2}}X_{t_{k-1}}^{m_{k-1}+m_k e^{-(t_k-t_{k-1})}})\\ &= \frac{\Gamma(1+x_k+m_k)}{\Gamma(1+x_{k-1})}\mathbb{E}(X_{t_1}^{\tilde{m}_1}\cdots X_{t_{k-1}}^{\tilde{m}_{k-1}}),\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{m}_j := m_j$ for $1 \le j \le k-2$ and $\tilde{m}_{k-1} := m_{k-1} + m_k e^{-(t_k-t_{k-1})}$. By induction,

$$\mathbb{E}(X_{t_1}^{\tilde{m}_1}\cdots X_{t_{k-1}}^{\tilde{m}_{k-1}}) = \prod_{j=1}^{k-1}\frac{\Gamma(1+y_j+\tilde{m}_j)}{\Gamma(1+y_{j-1})},$$

where $y_j := \sum_{i=j+1}^{k-1}\tilde{m}_i e^{-(t_i-t_j)}$ for all $j \in \{0,\dots,k-1\}$. The result follows since, for $1 \le j \le k-2$,

$$y_j = \sum_{i=j+1}^{k-2} m_i e^{-(t_i-t_j)} + (m_{k-1}+m_k e^{-(t_k-t_{k-1})})e^{-(t_{k-1}-t_j)} = \sum_{i=j+1}^{k} m_i e^{-(t_i-t_j)} = x_j$$

and $y_{k-1} = 0$ and, hence, $y_{k-1} + \tilde{m}_{k-1} = \tilde{m}_{k-1} = m_k e^{-(t_k-t_{k-1})} + m_{k-1} = x_{k-1} + m_{k-1}$. □

Remark. The mean $\mathbb{E}(X_t) = 1/\Gamma(1+e^{-t})$ is increasing for $t < t_0$ and decreasing for $t > t_0$, where $t_0 \approx 0.772987$ is the unique solution of the equation $\Psi(1+e^{-t_0}) = 0$ and $\Psi := \Gamma'/\Gamma$ denotes the logarithmic derivative of the gamma function. The process X is therefore neither a process with non-increasing paths nor a process with non-decreasing paths. In particular, we are not in the context of [5], where essentially all considered processes have non-increasing paths.

Corollary 2.2 *The Mittag–Leffler process $X = (X_t)_{t\ge0}$ is continuous in probability, i.e. $X_s \to X_t$ in probability as $s \to t$ for every $t \in [0,\infty)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.1, for all $s,t \in [0,\infty)$,

$$\mathbb{E}(X_s^2) = \frac{\Gamma(3)}{\Gamma(1+2e^{-s})} \to \frac{\Gamma(3)}{\Gamma(1+2e^{-t})} = \mathbb{E}(X_t^2), \qquad s \to t,$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}(X_sX_t) = \frac{\Gamma(2+e^{-|t-s|})}{\Gamma(1+e^{-s}+e^{-t})}\frac{\Gamma(2)}{\Gamma(1+e^{-|t-s|})} \to \frac{\Gamma(3)}{\Gamma(1+2e^{-t})} = \mathbb{E}(X_t^2), \qquad s \to t.$$

It follows that $\mathbb{E}((X_s-X_t)^2) = \mathbb{E}(X_s^2) - 2\mathbb{E}(X_sX_t) + \mathbb{E}(X_t^2) \to 0$ as $s \to t$. Thus, for all $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathbb{P}(|X_s - X_t| \ge \varepsilon) \le \mathbb{E}((X_s-X_t)^2)/\varepsilon^2 \to 0$ as $s \to t$. □

Remark. Note that (the Mittag–Leffler distributed random variable) X_t is not infinitely divisible. Moreover, X does not have independent increments. In particular, X is not a Lévy process. The process $(\log X_t)_{t\ge0}$ is as well not a Lévy process, since this process does not have independent increments either. This can be also seen as follows. The Fourier transform $\phi_t(x) := \mathbb{E}(e^{ix\log X_t}) = \mathbb{E}(X_t^{ix}) = \Gamma(1+ix)/\Gamma(1+ixe^{-t})$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, of $\log X_t$ is not the t-th power of $\phi_1(x)$.
We leave a possible construction of the Mittag–Leffler process via Lévy processes or subordinators, for example as a random time change and/or by taking the absolute value of a certain Lévy process, for future work. For related functionals of this type (local time processes, Bessel-type processes) we refer the reader to James [6] and the references therein.

We finally provide in this subsection some information on the generator A of the Mittag–Leffler process X, but we will not use the generator A in our further considerations. Suppose that $f \in B(E)$ is infinitely often differentiable and that f satisfies $f(y) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(f^{(k)}(x)/k!)(y-x)^k$ for all $x, y \in E$. Then

$$\frac{T_t f(x) - f(x)}{t} \;=\; \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{f^{(k)}(x)}{k!} \frac{\mathbb{E}((x^{e^{-t}}\eta_t - x)^k)}{t}.$$

Let $\Psi := \Gamma'/\Gamma$ denote the logarithmic derivative of the gamma function. Since

$$a_k(x) \;:=\; \lim_{t \searrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{E}((x^{e^{-t}}\eta_t - x)^k)}{t} \;=\; \begin{cases} x\Psi(2) - x\log x & \text{for } k = 1, \\ \dfrac{(-x)^k}{k-1} & \text{for } k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}, \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

the generator A of X satisfies

$$Af(x) \;=\; \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{f^{(k)}(x)}{k!} a_k(x)$$

with $a_k(x)$ defined via (10).

3 Moment calculations

In this section we provide formulas for certain moments of the block counting process $N^{(n)} = (N_t^{(n)})_{t \geq 0}$ of the Bolthausen–Sznitman n-coalescent. In the following we use for $x \in (0, \infty)$ and $m \in [0, \infty)$ the notation $[x]_m := \Gamma(x+m)/\Gamma(x)$. Note that for $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ the symbol $[x]_m = x(x+1)\cdots(x+m-1)$ coincides with the ascending factorial. The following lemma provides an explicit formula for the expectation of $[N_t^{(n)}]_m$.

Lemma 3.1 *Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in [0, \infty)$. For the Bolthausen–Sznitman coalescent the random variable $N_t^{(n)}$ satisfies for all $m \in [0, \infty)$*

$$\mathbb{E}([N_t^{(n)}]_m) \;=\; \Gamma(m+1) \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{j + me^{-t}}{j} \;=\; \Gamma(m+1) \binom{n-1+me^{-t}}{n-1} \;=\; \frac{\Gamma(m+1)}{\Gamma(1+me^{-t})} [n]_{me^{-t}}.$$

In particular,

$$\mathbb{E}(N_t^{(n)}) \;=\; \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{j + e^{-t}}{j} \;=\; \binom{n-1+e^{-t}}{n-1} \;=\; \frac{1}{\Gamma(1+e^{-t})} [n]_{e^{-t}} \;=\; \frac{\Gamma(n+e^{-t})}{\Gamma(n)\Gamma(1+e^{-t})}$$

and

$$\mathrm{Var}(N_t^{(n)}) \;=\; 2 \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{j + 2e^{-t}}{j} - \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{j + e^{-t}}{j} - \Bigg(\prod_{j=1}^{n-1} \frac{j + e^{-t}}{j} \Bigg)^2.$$

Proof. (of Lemma 3.1) Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $t \in [0,\infty)$. The formula obviously holds for $m = 0$. Thus, we can assume that $m \in (0,\infty)$. Clearly, $\mathbb{E}([N_t^{(n)}]_m) = \sum_{j=1}^n [j]_m p_{nj}(t)$, where $p_{nj}(t) := \mathbb{P}(N_t^{(n)} = j)$. In the following $s(.,.)$ and $S(.,.)$ denote the Stirling number of the first and second kind respectively. Plugging in

$$p_{nj}(t) \;=\; (-1)^{n+j}\frac{\Gamma(j)}{\Gamma(n)}\sum_{k=j}^n e^{-(k-1)t}s(n,k)S(k,j)$$

(see [12, Corollary 1.3], Equation (1.3), corrected by an obviously missing sign factor $(-1)^{k+j}$) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}([N_t^{(n)}]_m) &= \sum_{j=1}^n [j]_m(-1)^{n+j}\frac{\Gamma(j)}{\Gamma(n)}\sum_{k=j}^n e^{-(k-1)t}s(n,k)S(k,j)\\ &= \frac{(-1)^n}{\Gamma(n)}e^t\sum_{k=1}^n s(n,k)(e^{-t})^k\sum_{j=1}^k \Gamma(j+m)(-1)^j S(k,j).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\Gamma(j+m)(-1)^j = \Gamma(m)[m]_j(-1)^j = \Gamma(m)(-m)(-m-1)\cdots(-m-j+1) = \Gamma(m)(-m)_j$, where $(x)_j := x(x-1)\cdots(x-j+1)$, the last sum simplifies to $\sum_{j=1}^k \Gamma(j+m)(-1)^j S(k,j) = \Gamma(m)\sum_{j=1}^k (-m)_j S(k,j) = \Gamma(m)(-m)^k$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}([N_t^{(n)}]_m) &= \frac{(-1)^n}{\Gamma(n)}e^t\sum_{k=1}^n s(n,k)(e^{-t})^k\Gamma(m)(-m)^k\\ &= \Gamma(m)\frac{(-1)^n}{\Gamma(n)}e^t\sum_{k=1}^n s(n,k)(-me^{-t})^k \;=\; \Gamma(m)\frac{(-1)^n}{\Gamma(n)}e^t(-me^{-t})_n \;=\; \frac{\Gamma(m)}{\Gamma(n)}e^t[me^{-t}]_n\\ &= \Gamma(m+1)\prod_{j=1}^{n-1}\frac{j+me^{-t}}{j} \;=\; \Gamma(m+1)\binom{n-1+me^{-t}}{n-1} \;=\; \frac{\Gamma(m+1)}{\Gamma(1+me^{-t})}[n]_{me^{-t}}.\end{aligned}$$

Choosing $m = 1$ the formula for the mean of $N_t^{(n)}$ follows immediately. The formula for the variance of $N_t^{(n)}$ follows from $\mathrm{Var}(N_t^{(n)}) = \mathbb{E}([N_t^{(n)}]_2) - \mathbb{E}(N_t^{(n)}) - (\mathbb{E}(N_t^{(n)}))^2$. □

The following result (Lemma 3.2) is a generalization of Lemma 3.1. It will turn out to be quite useful later in order to verify the main convergence result (Theorem 1.1).

Lemma 3.2 *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 = t_0 \le t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_k$ and $m_1,\ldots,m_k \in [0,\infty)$. For $j \in \{0,\ldots,k\}$ define $x_j := x_j(k) := \sum_{i=j+1}^k m_i e^{-(t_i - t_j)}$. Note that $0 = x_k \le x_{k-1} \le \cdots \le x_2 \le x_1 \le x_0 = \sum_{i=1}^k m_i e^{-t_i}$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\prod_{j=1}^k [N_{t_j}^{(n)} + x_j]_{m_j}\Big) \;=\; [n]_{x_0}\prod_{j=1}^k \frac{\Gamma(1+x_j+m_j)}{\Gamma(1+x_{j-1})}. \tag{11}$$

Proof. (of Lemma 3.2) Induction on k. For $k = 1$ the assertion holds by Lemma 3.1. The induction step from $k-1$ to k (≥ 2) works as follows. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\Big(\prod_{j=1}^{k}[N_{t_j}^{(n)}+x_j]_{m_j}\Big) &= \mathbb{E}\Big(\mathbb{E}\Big(\prod_{j=1}^{k}[N_{t_j}^{(n)}+x_j]_{m_j}\Big|N_{t_1}^{(n)},\ldots,N_{t_{k-1}}^{(n)}\Big)\Big)\\ &= \mathbb{E}\Big(\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}[N_{t_j}^{(n)}+x_j]_{m_j}\mathbb{E}([N_{t_k}^{(n)}]_{m_k}\,|\,N_{t_{k-1}}^{(n)})\Big), \qquad (12)\end{aligned}$$

since $x_k = 0$. The process $N^{(n)} = (N_t^{(n)})_{t\geq 0}$ is time-homogeneous. Thus, for all $j \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$,

$$\mathbb{E}([N_{t_k}^{(n)}]_{m_k}\,|\,N_{t_{k-1}}^{(n)}=j) \;=\; \mathbb{E}([N_{t_k-t_{k-1}}^{(j)}]_{m_k}) \;=\; \frac{\Gamma(1+m_k)}{\Gamma(1+m_ke^{-(t_k-t_{k-1})})}[j]_{m_ke^{-(t_k-t_{k-1})}},$$

where the last equality holds by Lemma 3.1. Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}([N_{t_k}^{(n)}]_{m_k}\,|\,N_{t_{k-1}}^{(n)}) \;=\; \frac{\Gamma(1+m_k)}{\Gamma(1+m_ke^{-(t_k-t_{k-1})})}[N_{t_{k-1}}^{(n)}]_{m_ke^{-(t_k-t_{k-1})}}.$$

Plugging this into (12) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\Big(\prod_{j=1}^{k}[N_{t_j}^{(n)}+x_j]_{m_j}\Big) &= \frac{\Gamma(1+m_k)}{\Gamma(1+m_ke^{-(t_k-t_{k-1})})}\mathbb{E}\Big(\Big(\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}[N_{t_j}^{(n)}+x_j]_{m_j}\Big)[N_{t_{k-1}}^{(n)}]_{m_ke^{-(t_k-t_{k-1})}}\Big)\\ &= \frac{\Gamma(1+x_k+m_k)}{\Gamma(1+x_{k-1})}\mathbb{E}\Big(\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}[N_{t_j}^{(n)}+y_j]_{\tilde{m}_j}\Big),\end{aligned}$$

where $y_j := x_j$ and $\tilde{m}_j := m_j$ for $0 \leq j \leq k-2$, $y_{k-1} := 0$ and $\tilde{m}_{k-1} := m_{k-1}+x_{k-1}$. By induction,

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}[N_{t_j}^{(n)}+y_j]_{\tilde{m}_j}\Big) \;=\; [n]_{y_0}\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}\frac{\Gamma(1+y_j+\tilde{m}_j)}{\Gamma(1+y_{j-1})} \;=\; [n]_{x_0}\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}\frac{\Gamma(1+x_j+m_j)}{\Gamma(1+x_{j-1})},$$

and (11) follows immediately, which completes the induction. □

4 Proof of Theorem 1.1

The σ-algebra generated by $X_t^{(n)}$ coincides with the σ-algebra generated by $N_t^{(n)}$. Thus, the Markov property of the block counting process $N^{(n)}$ carries over to the scaled block counting process $X^{(n)}$. Note however that the process $X^{(n)}$ is time-inhomogeneous whereas $N^{(n)}$ is time-homogeneous.

As a warming up we first verify the convergence of the finite-dimensional distributions. Afterwards we turn to the convergence in $D_E[0,\infty)$. Since the proof of the convergence of the one-dimensional distributions turns out to be less technical, we start with a consideration of the one-dimensional distributions.

Step 1. (Convergence of the one-dimensional distributions) Recall that $S(.,.)$ denote the Stirling numbers of the second kind. Fix $t \in [0,\infty)$. Applying the formula

$$x^m \;=\; \sum_{i=0}^{m}(-1)^{m-i}S(m,i)[x]_i, \qquad m \in \mathbb{N}_0, \tag{13}$$

it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}((X_t^{(n)})^m) \;=\; \frac{1}{n^{me^{-t}}}\mathbb{E}((N_t^{(n)})^m) \;=\; \sum_{i=0}^{m}(-1)^{m-i}S(m,i)\frac{\mathbb{E}([N_t^{(n)}]_i)}{n^{me^{-t}}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}, m \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

By Lemma 3.1, $\mathbb{E}([N_t^{(n)}]_i) = (\Gamma(i+1)/\Gamma(1+ie^{-t}))[n]_{ie^{-t}} = \mathbb{E}(X_t^i)[n]_{ie^{-t}}$, leading to

$$\mathbb{E}((X_t^{(n)})^m) \;=\; \sum_{i=0}^{m}(-1)^{m-i}S(m,i)\mathbb{E}(X_t^i)\frac{[n]_{ie^{-t}}}{n^{me^{-t}}}, \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}, m \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Letting $n \to \infty$ shows that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}((X_t^{(n)})^m) = \mathbb{E}(X_t^m)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. This convergence of moments implies (see, for example, [1, Theorems 30.1 and 30.2]), the convergence $X_t^{(n)} \to X_t$ in distribution as $n \to \infty$. Thus, the convergence of the one-dimensional distributions holds.

Step 2. (Convergence of the finite-dimensional distributions) Let us now turn to the convergence of the k-dimensional distributions, $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Fix $0 = t_0 \le t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_k < \infty$ and $m_1, \ldots, m_k \in [0,\infty)$. For $j \in \{0,\ldots,k\}$ define $x_j := x_j(k) := \sum_{i=j+1}^{k} m_i e^{-(t_i - t_j)}$. Note that $x_k = 0$ and that $x_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{k} m_i e^{-t_i}$. We have

$$\prod_{j=1}^{k}\left(X_{t_j}^{(n)} + \frac{x_j}{n^{e^{-t_j}}}\right)^{m_j} \;=\; \prod_{j=1}^{k}\frac{(N_{t_j}^{(n)} + x_j)^{m_j}}{n^{me^{-t_j}}} \;=\; \frac{1}{n^{x_0}}\prod_{j=1}^{k}(N_{t_j}^{(n)} + x_j)^{m_j}.$$

Applying (13) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_{j=1}^{k}\left(X_{t_j}^{(n)} + \frac{x_j}{n^{e^{-t_j}}}\right)^{m_j} &= \frac{1}{n^{x_0}}\prod_{j=1}^{k}\left(\sum_{i_j=0}^{m_j}(-1)^{m_j-i_j}S(m_j,i_j)[N_{t_j}^{(n)} + x_j]_{i_j}\right)\\ &= \frac{1}{n^{x_0}}\sum_{i_1\le m_1,\ldots,i_k\le m_k}\left(\prod_{j=1}^{k}(-1)^{m_j-i_j}S(m_j,i_j)\right)\left(\prod_{j=1}^{k}[N_{t_j}^{(n)} + x_j]_{i_j}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation yields

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{j=1}^{k}\left(X_{t_j}^{(n)} + \frac{x_j}{n^{e^{-t_j}}}\right)^{m_j}\right)\\ &\qquad= \sum_{i_1\le m_1,\ldots,i_k\le m_k}\left(\prod_{j=1}^{k}(-1)^{m_j-i_j}S(m_j,i_j)\right)\frac{1}{n^{x_0}}\mathbb{E}\left(\prod_{j=1}^{k}[N_{t_j}^{(n)} + x_j]_{i_j}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

By Lemma 3.2, the last expectation is $O(n^{\sum_{j=1}^k i_j e^{-t_j}})$ and

$$\mathbb{E}(\prod_{j=1}^k [N_{t_j}^{(n)} + x_j]_{m_j}) \;=\; [n]_{x_0} \prod_{j=1}^k \frac{\Gamma(1+x_j+m_j)}{\Gamma(1+x_{j-1})} \;=\; [n]_{x_0} \mathbb{E}(X_{t_1}^{m_1} \cdots X_{t_k}^{m_k}),$$

where the last equality holds by Eq. (9) from Lemma 2.1. Thus, letting $n \to \infty$ in (14) yields

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\Big(\prod_{j=1}^k \Big(X_{t_j}^{(n)} + \frac{x_j}{n^{e^{-t_j}}} \Big)^{m_j} \Big) \;=\; \mathbb{E}(X_{t_1}^{m_1} \cdots X_{t_k}^{m_k}). \tag{15}$$

In order to get rid of the disturbing fractions $x_j/n^{e^{-t_j}}$ on the left hand side in (15) one may use the binomial formula

$$\Big(X_{t_j}^{(n)} + \frac{x_j}{n^{e^{-t_j}}} \Big)^{m_j} \;=\; \sum_{l_j=0}^{m_j} \binom{m_j}{l_j} \Big(\frac{x_j}{n^{e^{-t_j}}} \Big)^{m_j - l_j} (X_{t_j}^{(n)})^{l_j}$$

and conclude from (15) by induction on $m := m_1 + \cdots + m_k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}((X_{t_1}^{(n)})^{m_1} \cdots (X_{t_k}^{(n)})^{m_k}) \;=\; \mathbb{E}(X_{t_1}^{m_1} \cdots X_{t_k}^{m_k}), \qquad m_1, \ldots, m_k \in \mathbb{N}_0. \tag{16}$$

This convergence of moments implies (see, for example, [1, Problems 30.5 and 30.6]) the convergence $(X_{t_1}^{(n)}, \ldots, X_{t_k}^{(n)}) \to (X_{t_1}, \ldots, X_{t_k})$ in distribution as $n \to \infty$. Thus, the convergence of the finite-dimensional distributions holds.

Step 3. (Preparing the proof of the convergence in $D_E[0,\infty)$)
Let $M(E)$ denote the set of all measurable functions $f : E \to \mathbb{R}$. Define $E_n(s) := \{j/n^{e^{-s}} : j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $s \in [0,\infty)$ and

$$T_{s,t}^{(n)} f(x) \;:=\; \mathbb{E}(f(X_{s+t}^{(n)}) \,|\, X_s^{(n)} = x), \qquad n \in \mathbb{N}, s, t \in [0,\infty), f \in M(E), x \in E_n(s),$$

Note that $(T_{s,t}^{(n)})_{s,t\geq 0}$ is the semigroup of the time-inhomogeneous Markov process $X^{(n)}$. Let us verify that, for all $s, t \in [0,\infty)$, all polynomials $p : E \to \mathbb{R}$ and all compact sets $K \subseteq E$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{x \in E_n(s) \cap K} |T_{s,t}^{(n)} p(x) - T_t p(x)| \;=\; 0. \tag{17}$$

For $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ let $p_m : E \to \mathbb{R}$ denote the m-th monomial defined via $p_m(x) := x^m$, $x \in E$. Fix $s, t \in [0,\infty)$ and a compact set $K \subseteq E$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $x \in E_n(s)$ we have

$$T_{s,t}^{(n)} p_m(x) \;=\; \mathbb{E}((X_{s+t}^{(n)})^m \,|\, X_s^{(n)} = x) \;=\; \frac{\mathbb{E}((N_{s+t}^{(n)})^m \,|\, N_s^{(n)} = x n^{e^{-s}})}{n^{m e^{-(s+t)}}} \;=\; \frac{\mathbb{E}((N_t^{(x n^{e^{-s}})})^m)}{n^{m e^{-(s+t)}}},$$

where the last equality holds since the block counting process $N^{(n)} = (N_t^{(n)})_{t\geq 0}$ is time-homogeneous. By (13) and Lemma 3.1 it follows that

$$T_{s,t}^{(n)} p_m(x) \;=\; \sum_{i=0}^m (-1)^{m-i} S(m,i) \frac{\mathbb{E}([N_t^{(x n^{e^{-s}})}]_i)}{n^{m e^{-(s+t)}}} \;=\; \sum_{i=0}^m (-1)^{m-i} S(m,i) \mathbb{E}(X_t^i) \frac{[x n^{e^{-s}}]_{i e^{-t}}}{n^{m e^{-(s+t)}}}.$$

Since $T_t p_m(x) = \mathbb{E}(p_m(x^{e^{-t}} X_t)) = \mathbb{E}(X_t^m) x^{me^{-t}}$ it follows that

$$T_{s,t}^{(n)} p_m(x) - T_t p_m(x) \;=\; \mathbb{E}(X_t^m)\left(\frac{[xn^{e^{-s}}]_{me^{-t}}}{n^{me^{-(s+t)}}} - x^{me^{-t}} \right) + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} (-1)^{m-i} S(m,i) \mathbb{E}(X_t^i) \frac{[xn^{e^{-s}}]_{ie^{-t}}}{n^{me^{-(s+t)}}}.$$

It is straightforward to check that this expression converges uniformly for all $x \in E_n(s) \cap K$ (even uniformly for all x in any compact subset of E) to zero as $n \to \infty$. Therefore, (17) holds for every monomial $p := p_m$, $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and, by linearity, for all polynomials $p : E \to \mathbb{R}$.

Step 4. (Convergence in $D_E[0,\infty)$) According to a time-inhomogeneous variant of [4, p. 167, Theorem 2.5] it suffices to verify that for all $s,t \in [0,\infty)$ and all $f \in \widehat{C}(E)$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{x \in E_n(s)} |T_{s,t}^{(n)} f(x) - T_t f(x)| \;=\; 0. \tag{18}$$

Fix $s,t \in [0,\infty)$ and $f \in \widehat{C}(E)$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\|f\| > 0$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Since $f \in \widehat{C}(E)$ and $T_t f \in \widehat{C}(E)$, there exists a constant $x_0 = x_0(\varepsilon) \geq 1$ such that $|f(x)| < \varepsilon$ and $|T_t f(x)| < \varepsilon$ for all $x > x_0$. Moreover, since $\mathbb{P}(X_{s+t} \leq x_0 \,|\, X_s = x) = T_t 1_{(-\infty,x_0]}(x) = \mathbb{P}(x^{e^{-t}} X_t \leq x_0) = \mathbb{P}(X_t \leq x_0 / x^{e^{-t}}) \to \mathbb{P}(X_t \leq 0) = 0$ as $x \to \infty$, we can choose a real constant $L = L(\varepsilon) \geq x_0$ sufficiently large such that $\mathbb{P}(X_{s+t} \leq x_0 \,|\, X_s = x) < \varepsilon / \|f\|$ for all $x \geq L$. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $x \in E_n(s)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|T_{s,t}^{(n)} f(x)| &\leq \mathbb{E}(|f(X_{s+t}^{(n)})| \,|\, X_s^{(n)} = x) \\
&= \mathbb{E}(|f(X_{s+t}^{(n)})| \, 1_{\{X_{s+t}^{(n)} > x_0\}} \,|\, X_s^{(n)} = x) + \mathbb{E}(|f(X_{s+t}^{(n)})| \, 1_{\{X_{s+t}^{(n)} \leq x_0\}} \,|\, X_s^{(n)} = x) \\
&\leq \varepsilon + \|f\| \, \mathbb{P}(X_{s+t}^{(n)} \leq x_0 \,|\, X_s^{(n)} = x).
\end{aligned}$$

By Step 2, the convergence of the two-dimensional distributions holds. In particular, for every $x \geq 1$, $\mathbb{P}(X_{s+t}^{(n)} \leq x_0 \,|\, X_s^{(n)} = \lfloor xn^{e^{-s}} \rfloor / n^{e^{-s}})$ converges to $\mathbb{P}(X_{s+t} \leq x_0 \,|\, X_s = x)$ as $n \to \infty$ pointwise for all $x \geq 1$. Since the map $x \mapsto \mathbb{P}(X_{s+t} \leq x_0 \,|\, X_s = x) = T_t 1_{[0,x_0]}(x) = \mathbb{E}(1_{[0,x_0]}(x^{e^{-t}} X_t)) = \mathbb{P}(x^{e^{-t}} X_t \leq x_0)$, $x \geq 1$, is continuous, non-increasing and bounded, this convergence holds even uniformly for all $x \geq 1$. [The proof of this uniform convergence works essentially the same as the proof that pointwise convergence of distribution functions holds even uniform, if the limiting distribution function is continuous.] Thus, there exists $n_0 = n_0(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(X_{s+t}^{(n)} \leq x_0 \,|\, X_s^{(n)} = x) \leq \mathbb{P}(X_{s+t} \leq x_0 \,|\, X_s = x) + \varepsilon / \|f\|$ for all $n > n_0$ and all $x \in E_n(s) \cap [1,\infty)$. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n > n_0$ and all $x \in E_n(s) \cap [L,\infty)$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
|T_{s,t}^{(n)} f(x)| &\leq \varepsilon + \|f\| \left(\mathbb{P}(X_{s+t} \leq x_0 \,|\, X_s = x) + \frac{\varepsilon}{\|f\|} \right) \\
&= 2\varepsilon + \|f\| \, \mathbb{P}(X_{s+t} \leq x_0 \,|\, X_s = x) \;\leq\; 3\varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for all $n > n_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{x \in E_n(s) \cap [L,\infty)} |T_{s,t}^{(n)} f(x) - T_t f(x)| &\leq \sup_{x \in E_n(s) \cap [L,\infty)} |T_{s,t}^{(n)} f(x)| + \sup_{x \in E_n(s) \cap [L,\infty)} |T_t f(x)| \\
&\leq 3\varepsilon + \varepsilon \;=\; 4\varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus it is shown that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{x\in E_n(s)\cap[L,\infty)} |T_{s,t}^{(n)} f(x) - T_t f(x)| \;=\; 0.$$

Defining $K := [0, L]$ it remains to verify that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{x\in E_n(s)\cap K} |T_{s,t}^{(n)} f(x) - T_t f(x)| \;=\; 0. \tag{19}$$

By the Tschebyscheff-Markov inequality, for all $y > 0$ and all $x \in E_n(s) \cap K$,

$$T_t 1_{(y,\infty)}(x) \;=\; \mathbb{P}(X_{s+t} > y \,|\, X_s = x) \;\le\; \frac{1}{y}\mathbb{E}(X_{s+t} \,|\, X_s = x) \;=\; \frac{1}{y}\mathbb{E}(X_t)x^{e^{-t}} \;\le\; \frac{1}{y}\mathbb{E}(X_t)L^{e^{-t}}.$$

Moreover, making again use of the Tschebyscheff-Markov inequality and using Lemma 3.1, for all $y > 0$ and all $x \in E_n(s) \cap K$,

$$\begin{aligned} T_{s,t}^{(n)} 1_{(y,\infty)}(x) \;&=\; \mathbb{P}(X_{s+t}^{(n)} > y \,|\, X_s^{(n)} = x) \;\le\; \frac{1}{y}\mathbb{E}(X_{s+t}^{(n)} \,|\, X_s^{(n)} = x) \;=\; \frac{1}{y}\mathbb{E}(X_t)\frac{[xn^{e^{-s}}]_{e^{-t}}}{n^{e^{-(s+t)}}} \\ &\le\; \frac{1}{y}\mathbb{E}(X_t)\frac{[Ln^{e^{-s}}]_{e^{-t}}}{n^{e^{-(s+t)}}} \;\sim\; \frac{1}{y}\mathbb{E}(X_t)L^{e^{-t}}, \qquad n\to\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can choose a real constant $y_0 = y_0(\varepsilon) \ge x_0$ (which may depend on s, t and L but not on n) sufficiently large such that

$$T_t 1_{(y_0,\infty)}(x) \;\le\; \varepsilon \quad\text{and}\quad T_{s,t}^{(n)} 1_{(y_0,\infty)}(x) \;\le\; \varepsilon \tag{20}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $x \in E_n(s) \cap K$. With this choice of y_0 we are now able to verify (19) as follows. Since $|f(y)| < \varepsilon$ for all $y > x_0$ and, hence, for all $y > y_0$, we obtain for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $x \in E_n(s)$

$$|T_{s,t}^{(n)} f(x) - T_t f(x)| \;\le\; 2\varepsilon + |T_{s,t}^{(n)} g(x) - T_t g(x)|,$$

where $g := f1_{[0,y_0]}$. By the Weierstrass approximation theorem we can approximate the continuous function f uniformly on the compact interval $[0, y_0]$ by a polynomial p. Hence, there exists a polynomial p such that $\|g - h\| < \varepsilon$, where $h := p1_{[0,y_0]}$. Thus, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $x \in E_n(s)$

$$|T_{s,t}^{(n)} f(x) - T_t f(x)| \;\le\; 4\varepsilon + |T_{s,t}^{(n)} h(x) - T_t h(x)| \;\le\; 4\varepsilon + |T_{s,t}^{(n)} p(x) - T_t p(x)| + |T_{s,t}^{(n)} r(x)| + |T_t r(x)|,$$

where $r := p - h = p - p1_{[0,y_0]} = p1_{(y_0,\infty)}$. We have already shown in Step 3 that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \sup_{x\in E_n(s)\cap K} |T_{s,t}^{(n)} p(x) - T_t p(x)| \;=\; 0.$$

Thus it remains to treat $|T_{s,t}^{(n)} r(x)|$ and $|T_t r(x)|$. Applying the Hölder inequality and using (20) we obtain

$$|T_{s,t}^{(n)} r(x)| \;\le\; T_{s,t}^{(n)} p^2(x)\, T_{s,t}^{(n)} 1_{(y_0,\infty)}(x) \;\le\; \varepsilon T_{s,t}^{(n)} p^2(x)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $x \in E_n(s) \cap K$. Thus it remains to show that $T^{(n)}_{s,t} p^2(x)$ is bounded uniformly for all $x \in E_n(s) \cap K$. We have

$$\sup_{x \in E_n(s) \cap K} |T^{(n)}_{s,t} p^2(x)| \;\leq\; \sup_{x \in E_n(s) \cap K} |T^{(n)}_{s,t} p^2(x) - T_t p^2(x)| + \sup_{x \in K} |T_t p^2(x)|.$$

Since p^2 is a polynomial, the first expression converges to zero as $n \to \infty$ by Step 3. The last supremum is obviously bounded, since $T_t p^2$ is continuous and hence bounded on the compact set K, i.e. $M := \sup_{x \in K} |T_t p^2(x)| < \infty$. Similarly, by Hölder inequality and (20), $|T_t r(x)| \leq T_t p^2(x) T_t 1_{(y_0,\infty)}(x) \leq \varepsilon T_t p^2(x) \leq \varepsilon M$ for all $x \in E_n(s) \cap K$. In summary, (19) is established. The proof is complete. □

5 Appendix

In this appendix we collect essentially two results. The first result (Lemma 5.1) concerns the Laplace exponent of the subordinator S introduced at the beginning of Section 2. The second result (Lemma 5.3) concerns some fundamental properties of the semigroup $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ defined via (8).

Lemma 5.1 *Fix $\alpha \in (0,1)$. The drift-free subordinator $S = (S_t)_{t \geq 0}$ with killing rate $k := 1/\Gamma(1-\alpha)$ and Lévy measure ϱ with density (3) has Laplace exponent (4).*

Proof. By the Lévy-Khintchine representation, the subordinator S has Laplace exponent $\Phi(x) = k + \int_{(0,\infty)} (1 - e^{-xu})\, \varrho(\mathrm{d}u)$, $x \in [0,\infty)$. Since ϱ has density (3) it follows that

$$\Phi(x) \;=\; k + \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_0^\infty (1 - e^{-xu}) \frac{e^{-u/\alpha}}{(1 - e^{-u/\alpha})^{\alpha+1}}\, \mathrm{d}u.$$

The substitution $y = 1 - e^{-u/\alpha}$ ($\Rightarrow u = -\alpha \log(1-y)$ and $\mathrm{d}u/\mathrm{d}y = \alpha/(1-y)$) leads to

$$\Phi(x) \;=\; k + \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\alpha)} \int_0^1 (1 - (1-y)^{\alpha x}) \frac{\alpha}{y^{\alpha+1}}\, \mathrm{d}y. \tag{21}$$

Partial integration with $u(y) := 1 - (1-y)^{\alpha x}$ and $v(y) := -y^{-\alpha}$ turns the last integral into

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 (1 - (1-y)^{\alpha x}) \frac{\alpha}{y^{\alpha+1}}\, \mathrm{d}y \;&=\; \big[(1 - (1-y)^{\alpha x})(-y^{-\alpha})\big]_0^1 - \int_0^1 \alpha x (1-y)^{\alpha x - 1} (-y^{-\alpha})\, \mathrm{d}y \\ &=\; -1 + \alpha x \int_0^1 y^{-\alpha} (1-y)^{\alpha x - 1}\, \mathrm{d}y \;=\; -1 + \alpha x B(1-\alpha, \alpha x) \;=\; -1 + \frac{\Gamma(1-\alpha)\Gamma(1+\alpha x)}{\Gamma(1-\alpha+\alpha x)}. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into (21) and noting that $k = 1/\Gamma(1-\alpha)$ yields $\Phi(x) = \Gamma(1+\alpha x)/\Gamma(1-\alpha+\alpha x)$, which is (4). □

Let $E := [0,\infty)$ and let $\widehat{C}(E)$ denote the set of continuous functions $f : E \to \mathbb{R}$ vanishing at infinity. The following result is well known, we nevertheless mention it since it will turn out to be useful to verify fundamental properties of the semigroup $(T_t)_{t \geq 0}$ defined via (8).

Lemma 5.2 *Every $f \in \widehat{C}(E)$ is uniformly continuous on E.*

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Since f vanishes at infinity, there exists $x_0 \in [0,\infty)$ such that $|f(x)| < \varepsilon/2$ for all $x \in [x_0,\infty)$. By the theorem of Heine, f is uniformly continuous on $[0, x_0+1]$. Thus, there exists $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) \in (0,1)$ such that $|f(x)-f(y)| < \varepsilon$ for all $x, y \in [0, x_0+1]$ with $|x-y| < \delta$. If $|x-y| < \delta$ but $x > x_0+1$ or $y > x_0+1$, then $x \geq x_0$ and $y \geq x_0$ and hence $|f(x)-f(y)| \leq |f(x)| + |f(y)| < \varepsilon/2 + \varepsilon/2 = \varepsilon$. Thus, $|f(x)-f(y)| < \varepsilon$ for all $x, y \in E$ with $|x-y| < \delta$. □

Lemma 5.3 *For every $t \in [0,\infty)$ the operator T_t defined via (8) satisfies $T_t\widehat{C}(E) \subseteq \widehat{C}(E)$. Moreover, for every $f \in \widehat{C}(E)$, $\lim_{t\to 0} T_t f(x) = f(x)$ uniformly for all $x \in E$, so $(T_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is a strongly continuous semigroup on $\widehat{C}(E)$.*

Proof. For $t \in [0,\infty)$, $f \in \widehat{C}(E)$ and $x \in E$ we have

$$(T_t f)(x) \;=\; \int_E f(x^{e^{-t}} y)\mathbb{P}_{\eta_t}(\mathrm{d}y) \;\to\; 0, \qquad x \to \infty,$$

by dominated convergence and, similarly,

$$(T_t f)(x) - (T_t f)(x_0) \;=\; \int_E (f(x^{e^{-t}} y) - f(x_0^{e^{-t}} y))\,\mathbb{P}_{\eta_t}(\mathrm{d}y) \;\to\; 0, \qquad x \to x_0,$$

again by dominated convergence. Thus $T_t\widehat{C}(E) \subseteq \widehat{C}(E)$ for all $t \in [0,\infty)$.
In order to prove the second statement fix $f \in \widehat{C}(E)$. Note that f is bounded, i.e. $\|f\| := \sup_{x\in E}|f(x)| < \infty$. For $\alpha \in [0,1]$ let Z_α denote a random variable being Mittag–Leffler distributed with parameter α. Since $T_t f(x) = \mathbb{E}(f(x^{e^{-t}}\eta_t))$, where η_t is Mittag–Leffler distributed with parameter $\alpha := e^{-t}$, we have to verify that $\lim_{\alpha\to 1}\mathbb{E}(f(x^\alpha Z_\alpha)) = f(x)$ uniformly for all $x \in E$, where without loss of generality we can assume that $\alpha \in [1/2, 1]$.
Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Since f vanishes at infinity, there exists a constant $x_0 \in [1,\infty)$ such that $|f(x)| < \varepsilon$ for all $x \geq x_0$. Define $K := 4x_0^2$ ($\geq x_0 \geq 1$). In the following the uniform convergence $\lim_{\alpha\to 1}\mathbb{E}(f(x^\alpha Z_\alpha)) = f(x)$ is verified by distinguishing the two situations $x \in [K,\infty)$ and $x \in [0,K]$. For $x \in [K,\infty)$ we essentially exploit the fact that f vanishes at infinity. For $x \in [0,K]$ the uniform continuity of f (Lemma 5.2) comes into play. Let us start with the case $x \in [K,\infty)$. For all $x \geq K$ and all $z \geq 1/2$ we have $x^\alpha z \geq x^\alpha/2 \geq \sqrt{x}/2 \geq \sqrt{K}/2 = x_0$ and, hence, $|f(x^\alpha z)| < \varepsilon$. We therefore obtain uniformly for all $x \geq K$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(f(x^\alpha Z_\alpha)) - f(x) \;&\leq\; \int_E |f(x^\alpha z) - f(x)|\,\mathbb{P}_{Z_\alpha}(\mathrm{d}z) \\
&\leq\; \int_{[1/2,\infty)} \underbrace{|f(x^\alpha z) - f(x)|}_{\leq 2\varepsilon}\,\mathbb{P}_{Z_\alpha}(\mathrm{d}z) + \int_{[0,1/2)} \underbrace{|f(x^\alpha z) - f(x)|}_{\leq 2\|f\|}\,\mathbb{P}_{Z_\alpha}(\mathrm{d}z) \\
&\leq\; 2\varepsilon + 2\,\|f\|\,\mathbb{P}(Z_\alpha < 1/2) \;\to\; 2\varepsilon
\end{aligned}$$

as $\alpha \to 1$, since $Z_\alpha \to Z_1 \equiv 1$ in distribution as $\alpha \to 1$.
Assume now that $x \in [0,K]$. By Lemma 5.2 the function f is uniformly continuous on E. Thus, there exists a constant $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that $|f(y) - f(x)| < \varepsilon$ for all $x, y \in E$ with $|y-x| < \delta$. Since x^α converges to x as $\alpha \to 1$ uniformly on $[0,K]$ we can choose $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(\delta) = \alpha_0(\varepsilon) < 1$

sufficiently close to 1 such that $|x^\alpha - x| < \delta/2$ for all $\alpha \in [\alpha_0, 1]$ and all $x \in [0, K]$. For all $\alpha \in [\alpha_0, 1]$, $x \in [0, K]$ and all $z \in E$ with $|z-1| < \gamma := \delta/(2K)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |x^\alpha z - x| &\leq |x^\alpha z - x^\alpha| + |x^\alpha - x| = x^\alpha |z-1| + |x^\alpha - x| \\ &< K^\alpha |z-1| + \frac{\delta}{2} \leq K|z-1| + \frac{\delta}{2} < K\gamma + \frac{\delta}{2} = \delta, \end{aligned}$$

and, hence, $|f(x^\alpha z) - f(x)| < \varepsilon$. For all $\alpha \in [\alpha_0, 1]$ and all $x \in [0, K]$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}(f(x^\alpha Z_\alpha)) - f(x)| &\leq \int_E |f(x^\alpha z) - f(x)| \, \mathbb{P}_{Z_\alpha}(\mathrm{d}z) \\ &= \int_{\{|z-1|<\gamma\}} \underbrace{|f(x^\alpha z) - f(x)|}_{\leq \varepsilon} \, \mathbb{P}_{Z_\alpha}(\mathrm{d}z) + \int_{\{|z-1|\geq\gamma\}} \underbrace{|f(x^\alpha z) - f(x)|}_{\leq 2\|f\|} \, \mathbb{P}_{Z_\alpha}(\mathrm{d}z) \\ &\leq \varepsilon + 2\,\|f\|\,\mathbb{P}(|Z_\alpha - 1| \geq \gamma) \to \varepsilon \end{aligned}$$

as $\alpha \to 1$, since $Z_\alpha \to Z_1 \equiv 1$ in probability as $\alpha \to 1$. In summary it is shown that $\lim_{\alpha\to 1} \mathbb{E}(f(x^\alpha Z_\alpha)) = f(x)$ uniformly for all $x \in E$. Thus, $\lim_{t\to 0} T_t f(x) = f(x)$ uniformly for all $x \in E$. □

References

[1] Billingsley, P. (1995) *Probability and Measure*. 3rd edition, Wiley, New York. MR1324786

[2] Bolthausen, E. and Sznitman, A.-S. (1998) On Ruelle's probability cascades and an abstract cavity method. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **197**, 247–276. MR1652734

[3] Carmona, P., Petit, F. and Yor, M. (1997) On the distribution and asymptotic results for exponential functionals of Lévy processes. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana* **14**, 311–367. MR1648657

[4] Ethier, S. N. and Kurtz, T. G. (1986) *Markov Processes, Characterization and Convergence*. Wiley, New York. MR0838085

[5] Haas, B. and Miermont, G. (2011) Self-similar scaling limits of non-increasing Markov chains. *Bernoulli* **17**, 1217–1247. MR2854770

[6] James, L. F. (2010) Lamperti-type laws. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **20**, 1303–1340. MR2676940

[7] Jayakumar, K. (2003) Mittag–Leffler process. *Math. Comput. Modelling* **37**, 1427–1434. MR1996047

[8] Jayakumar, K. and Pillai, R. N. (1993) The first-order autoregressive Mittag–Leffler process. *J. Appl. Probab.* **30**, 462–466. MR1212678

[9] Limic, V. (2012) Genealogies of regular exchangeable coalescents with applications to sampling. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* **48**, 706–720. MR2976560

[10] Madan, D. B. and Yor, M. (2002) Making Markov martingales meet marginals: with explicit constructions. *Bernoulli* **8**, 509–536. MR1914701

[11] Mainardi, F. and Gorenflo, R. (2000) On Mittag–Leffler-type functions in fractional evolution processes. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **118**, 283–299. MR1765955

[12] Möhle, M. and Pitters, H. (2014) A spectral decomposition for the block counting process of the Bolthausen–Sznitman coalescent. *Electron. Commun. Probab.* **19**, paper 47, 1–11. MR number not yet available

[13] Pillai, R. N. (1990) On Mittag–Leffler functions and related distributions. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* **42**, 157–161. MR1054728

[14] Pitman, J. (1999) Coalescents with multiple collisions. *Ann. Probab.* **27**, 1870–1902. MR1742892

[15] Sagitov, S. (1999) The general coalescent with asynchronous mergers of ancestral lines. *J. Appl. Probab.* **36**, 1116–1125. MR1742154